

## **REMARKS**

In the final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 6-8, 10-15, 19-21, 23-29, 33-35, 37-43, 47-49, 51, and 52 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,480,860, issued to Monday; claims 3-5, 17, 18, 30-32, and 44-46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Monday in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,732,360, issued to Seo; and claims 9, 22, 36, and 50 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Monday in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,826,270, issued to Rutkowski. By this amendment, Applicants amend claims 1, 25, 26, 33 and 52, cancel claims 11-24 and 38-51, and add new claims 53 and 54. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-10, 25-37, and 52-54 are now pending. The rejection of claims 11-24 and 38-51 is now moot. Applicants traverse the rejections of claims 1-10, 25-37, and 52 for the following reasons.

### **I. 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Rejections**

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 2, 6-8, 10, 25-29, 33-35, 37, and 52 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,480,860, issued to Monday. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Monday discloses a system for using a markup language, such as XML, to allow a user to access information in a database. Data requests are made from a markup language interface, such as an XML interface, and are then sent through a translator, or bridge, which parses the requests and sends them to an appropriate source (i.e. database) that contains the requested data. The source then retrieves the data and sends it back to the translator, which constructs an XML document with the retrieved data and sends it back to the requesting client. See col. 7, lines 24-67. Monday,

however, does not disclose the system, method, or computer program product as recited in independent claims 1, 25, and 52.

For example, claim 1 recites, inter alia, “sending, by the requestor application, an information request to a master pivot program, the information request including document information related to a requested financing document.” Monday only discloses data requests, and fails to disclose financing documents. Therefore, Monday fails to disclose an information request that includes document information related to a requested financing document. As such, Monday does not teach each and every element of claim 1, and thus the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Claim 25 recites, inter alia, “a requestor application for generating an information request, the information request including document information related to a first requested information document that is part of a group of requested documents.” Monday does not disclose a requested information document that is part of a group of requested documents. Instead, Monday only discloses requests for data. As such, Monday does not teach each and every element of claim 25, and thus the rejection of claim 25 should be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Independent claim 52, although of different scope from claim 25, also recites “a first requested information document that is part of a group of requested documents.” Thus claim 52 is distinguishable from the cited art for at least similar reasons to those discussed above in connection with claim 25. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 52 should be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Dependent claims 2, 6-8, 10, 26-29, 33-35, 37, 53, and 54 depend from one of respective claims 1, 25, and 52. As explained above, independent claims 1, 25, and 52 are distinguishable from the cited art. Therefore, dependent claims 2, 6-8, 10, 26-29, 33-35, 37, 53, and 54 are also distinguishable from the cited art for at least the same reasons set forth above in connection with independent claims 1, 25, and 52. Accordingly, the rejection of these claims should be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

## **II. 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections**

The Office Action rejected claims 3-5 and 30-32 as being unpatentable over Monday in view of Seo, and rejected claims 9 and 36 as being unpatentable over Monday in view of Rutkowski. However, as discussed above, Monday fails to disclose certain claim features present in the pending independent claims. For example, Monday fails to disclose a requested financing document, as recited in claim 1, and a first requested information document that is part of a group of requested documents, as recited in claim 25. Neither Seo, nor Rutkowski cure these deficiencies. Thus, Applicants respectfully traverse the Section 103(a) rejections, for at least the same reasons described above.

## **III. Conclusion:**

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants submit that claims 1-10, 25-37, and 52-54 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of the cited art. Applicants therefore request the Examiner's reconsideration of the application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

The final Office Action contains characterizations of the claims and the related art with which Applicants do not necessarily agree. Unless expressly noted otherwise, Applicants decline to subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

If a telephone interview will expedite issuance of this application, the Examiner is requested to call Applicants' representative, whose name and registration number appear below, to discuss any remaining issues.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: June 15, 2006

By: Bradley Edelman  
Bradley E. Edelman  
Reg. No. 57,648